

## REMARKS

Applicants wish to extend their gratitude to Examiner Blair for his comments on March 22, 2007 and April 12, 2007 with regard to the last Office Action of January 4, 2007 and the prosecution of this patent application. This Response/Amendment includes claims amended per our discussions. In addition, this Response provides arguments which distinguish the currently amended claims over the cited prior art, specifically addressing Barnes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,475).

In light of the currently amended claims, supporting arguments and previous discussions with Examiner Blair, it is believed this patent application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the application is requested.

### **The Office Action**

Claims 1-6, 11-12, 16, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,970,475 to Barnes et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0036949 by Kaddeche et al.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,970,475 to Barnes et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0036949 by Kaddeche et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,415,320 to Hess et al.

Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,970,475 to Barnes et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0036949 by Kaddeche et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,636,863 to Friesen.

Claims 10, 14, 17, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,970,475 to Barnes et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0036949 by Kaddeche et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,987,423 to Arnold et al.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,970,475 to Barnes et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0036949 by Kaddeche et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,987,423 to Arnold et al. and U.S. Patent Number 6,415,320 to Hess et al.

Claims 1-7, 9-19, and 21-23 remain in this application. Claims 8 and 20 were previously canceled; claims 1, 11 and 23 are currently amended; claims 6, 7, 9, 16, 18,

19, 21 and 22 were previously amended; and claims 2-5, 10, 12, 13, 17 and 18 are as originally presented.

### **RESPONSE**

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-6, 11-12, 16 and 23 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes et al. in view of Kaddeche et al., the Applicants respectively traverse this grounds of rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Independent claims 1, 11 and 23 have been currently amended to limit the claimed subject matter to a system and method for generating a requisition for user selectable inventory items comprising a server computer system configured to:

"associate one or more of a plurality of web page work sites with each of said users, wherein access to each worksite is restricted to a specific group of users associated with a common geographical area ... wherein the system is configured to allow a first user to access a first web work site including printable materials tailored to a geographical attribute of the first user, and a second user to access a second web work site including printable materials tailored to a geographical attribute of the second user."

In contrast, Barnes et al. discloses an electronic procurement system whereby a user logs on to the system and is subsequently authenticated for connection to a main menu for purchasing of items (col. 23, lines 25-36). Notably, all users of the Barnes system conduct purchasing activities by accessing screens common to all users. Any necessary purchasing parameters or limits are associated with the users log on (col. 22, lines 25-36). In other words, the Barnes system does not include *working web sites* which are restricted to only group members, as disclosed in the Applicants' patent application and presently claimed. The Barnes system restricts purchasing of a selected item based on limits or parameters associated with the user (col. 22, lines 46-55) while providing non-restricted access to any screens/menus providing item listings for all users, regardless of their authorization to purchase the listed items. In other words, a user of the Barnes system is not associated with a working web site which

provides a listing of items available for requisition by the working web site group members/users of the working web site, as currently claimed by the Applicants.

With regard to Kaddeche et al., the last Office Action argues that Barnes et al. does not explicitly teach group worksites accessible to a specific group of users associated with a common geographical area. However, the last Office Action asserts Kaddeche teaches a system for generating a requisition with user selectable inventory items comprising printed material associated with a particular geographical area at paragraphs 31-34 of Kaddeche et al.

In light of the presently presented amended independent claims 1, 11 and 23, this argument is respectively traversed. Specifically, the applicants' claimed subject matter recites the limitation "... wherein access to each worksite is restricted to a specific group of users associated with a common geographical area... ."

Conversely, Kaddeche et al. teaches a method and system for targeting internet advertisements to specific users. The advertisements may be for a tax form based on a user's geographical location, however, access to any website associated with the advertisement is not restricted. (Paragraphs 34-35)

With regard to currently amended independent claims 1, 11 and 23, specifically, the currently claimed limitation " ... wherein the system is configured to allow a first user to access a first web work site including printable materials tailored to a geographical attribute of the first user, and a second user to access a second web work site including printable materials tailored to a geographical attribute of the second user," the Applicants assert Barnes et al. and Kaddeche et al. do not disclose/teach a system or method of generating a requisition which provides user tailored/accessible work sites for requisitioning items as claimed.

With regard to dependent claims 6-7, 9-10, 12-19 and 22-23, which all depend from one of independent claims 1, 11 or 23, the Applicants respectively traverse the grounds for rejecting these claims discussed in the last Office Action. Specifically, in light of the currently amended independent claims 1, 11 and 23, and the arguments presented heretofore in this response, it is believed these claims are not obvious in view of the cited prior art because they depend from independent claims 1, 11 or 23, which are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed in this response.

**CONCLUSION**


For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-7, 9-19, and 21-23) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment A. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Jeffrey N. Zahn, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.


Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey N. Zahn, Reg. No. 54,864  
Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580  
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor  
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579  
216-861-5582

5/4/2007

Date

<b><u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u></b>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any item referred to herein as being attached or enclosed) is (are) being	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.	
<input type="checkbox"/> transmitted to the USPTO by facsimile in accordance with 37 CFR 1.18 on the date indicated below.	
Express Mail Label No.:	Signature: 
Date: 5-4-07	Name: Christie L. Cermak